

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 247

June 9, 1995, 11:03 a.m.
Page S-8064 Temp. Record

TELECOMMUNICATIONS/Bell InterLATA Mobile Services

SUBJECT: Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995 . . . S. 652. Santorum amendment No. 1267.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 83-4

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 652, the Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995, will amend telecommunications laws and reduce regulations in order to promote competition in the telecommunications industry by eliminating barriers that prevent telephone companies, cable companies, and broadcasters from entering one another's markets. It will also permit electric utilities to enter the cable and telephone markets. Judicial control of telecommunications policy, including the "Modified Final Judgment" regime, will be terminated.

The Santorum amendment would amend the terms under which a Bell Operating Company (BOC) may provide interLATA services by clarifying that it may offer interLATA commercial mobile service except where such service is a replacement for land line telephone exchange service for a substantial portion of the land line telephone exchange service in a State. (LATAs, or local access transport areas, are the boundaries that currently determine the areas within which local phone service may be provided by Bell Operating Companies. The AT&T consent decree, under which AT&T agreed to stop providing local phones services, resulted in the creation of seven Regional Bell Operating Companies (RBOCs), which are holding companies that own BOCs. BOCs provide local phone services. Originally, there were 23 BOCs. The consent decree created 160 LATAs and provided that a BOC may provide local phone service within LATA boundaries, but may not provide phone service across LATA boundaries.)

Those favoring the amendment contended:

In 1984, AT&T entered into a consent decree whereby it could keep its long distance services but it had to divest its local telephone services. Those services became independent Bell Operating Companies (BOCs). BOCs are permitted to provide service within geographic boundaries known as local access transport areas, or LATAs, of which there are 160, but they may not provide services between LATAs. The LATA boundaries were drawn in the consent decree based upon the then existing wire-based telephone

(See other side)

YEAS (83)				NAYS (4)		NOT VOTING (13)	
Republican (44 or 98%)		Democrats (39 or 93%)		Republicans (1 or 2%)	Democrats (3 or 7%)	Republicans (9)	Democrats (4)
Abraham	Hutchison	Akaka	Hollings	Gorton	Byrd	Ashcroft ⁻²	Biden ⁻⁴
Bennett	Inhofe	Baucus	Inouye		Murray	Coverdell ⁻²	Boxer ⁻²
Bond	Jeffords	Bingaman	Johnston		Reid	Gramm ⁻²	Kennedy ⁻²
Brown	Kassebaum	Bradley	Kerrey			Helms ⁻²	Nunn ⁻²
Burns	Kempthorne	Breaux	Kerry			Shelby ⁻²	
Campbell	Kyl	Bryan	Kohl			Simpson ^{-2AY}	
Chafee	Lott	Bumpers	Lautenberg			Specter ⁻²	
Coats	Lugar	Conrad	Leahy			Stevens ⁻²	
Cochran	Mack	Daschle	Levin			Thomas ⁻²	
Cohen	McCain	Dodd	Lieberman				
Craig	McConnell	Dorgan	Mikulski				
D'Amato	Murkowski	Exon	Moseley-Braun				
DeWine	Nickles	Feingold	Moynihan				
Dole	Packwood	Feinstein	Pell				
Domenici	Pressler	Ford	Pryor				
Faircloth	Roth	Glenn	Robb				
Frist	Santorum	Graham	Rockefeller				
Grams	Smith	Harkin	Sarbanes				
Grassley	Snowe	Heflin	Simon				
Gregg	Thompson		Wellstone				
Hatch	Thurmond						
Hatfield	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

network. Since that time, these wireline LATAs have been applied to new wireless services, such as cellular phones, offered by the Bell companies. Bell operating companies are the only companies involved in providing mobile phone services that are restricted in the areas in which they may offer those services. This fact puts them at a competitive disadvantage. The bill will attempt to remove that disadvantage, but an ambiguity in its wording will make its effect subject to misinterpretation. The Santorum amendment would remove this ambiguity, and thus deserves our support.

No arguments were expressed in opposition to the amendment.